

Remarks

This Election is responsive to the Restriction Requirement issued of **May 9, 2005**.

Summary of The Restriction

Restriction to one of the following inventions was required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 17-18 and 27-29, drawn to a method of aligning print media and a method of moving print media, classified in class 271, subclass 226.

II. Claims 1-16 and 19-26, drawn to a media registration mechanism, a media steering mechanism and an image forming device, classified in class 271, subclass 234.

Election


In response to the Restriction Requirement, Applicant elects to prosecute Group II, claims 1-16 and 19-26, with traverse.

Applicant does not believe that Group I claims are distinct from Group II claims in accordance with MPEP 806.05(e). The Office Action, in paragraph 2 on page 2, provides a conclusion for the restriction but provides no examples. The Office Action simply states that the claimed process can be practiced by any apparatus that can perform the claimed operational steps. Thus, no examples that recite material differences have been provided. According to MPEP 806.05(e), "The burden is on the examiner to provide reasonable examples that recite material differences."

Since the Examiner has not provided a reasonable example, a *prima facie* case for the propriety of the restriction requirement has not been presented. Thus, the restriction should be withdrawn.

7-JUNE-2005

Respectfully submitted,



PETAR KRAGULJAC (Reg. No. 38,520)
(216) 348-5843